

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-10, 15, 17, 29-31, 41 and 42 are now pending in the application. Claims 41 and 42 are new. Claims 5, 11-14, 16, 18-28, 32-40 have been cancelled without prejudice. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-7, 9-10, 12-23, 25-30 and 33-36 and 38-40 were rejected as being obvious over D.E. Protzmann (U.S. 3,159,446). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Initially the Examiner will note that independent claims 1 and 29 have been amended to more positively recite that the methods claimed are for forming an interconnection system for interconnecting cables on opposite sides of an internal wall panel within a mobile platform (Claim 1), or an interior wall panel of an aircraft (Claim 29). Claims 1 and 29 have also each been amended to include the operations of:

securing a peripheral edge of a bracket to said interior wall panel over an opening in said interior wall panel, such that a support member extending from said bracket extends through said opening in said interior wall panel;
and

securing said support member in a fixed position, relative to said opening, that results in said attachment of said first and second cables to said support member to be disposed at a position elevationally offset from said opening in the panel; and . . .

Claim 29 has been somewhat similarly amended, and further now includes the operation of securing a cover having an integrally formed offset portion to said peripheral edge of said bracket, the offset portion forming a narrow opening generally

parallel to a surface of said interior wall panel through which said first electrical cable extends.

Protzmann does not disclose or suggest the methods now recited in claims 1 and 29. Protzmann is directed to a “pilfer proof” wall plate. The structure shown in this reference does not relate to, and does not suggest, a method by a bracket member is secured over an opening in an interior wall panel, nor an operation by which a generally planar support member extends from a peripheral portion of a bracket member, and which positions the coupling of first and second cables at a position elevationally offset from the bracket member. In Protzmann, the body of the duplex receptacle (11) does not form a “generally planar” member, nor does the coupling of the electrical plug 19 occur at a point “elevationally offset from the bracket member”, as now recited in claims 1 and 29. Rather, electrical coupling appears to occur at the surface plane of the wall 15.

Claim 29 has been further amended, as noted above, to include the operation of securing a cover having an integrally formed offset portion that forms a narrow opening generally parallel to a surface of said interior wall panel. This operation is also not disclosed or suggested by Protzmann. Protzmann appears to include a small circular opening in the cover 20 through which an electrical cable extends. However, this circular opening is certainly not a “narrow opening generally parallel to the surface of the interior wall panel”. Instead this opening is arranged generally perpendicular to the wall surface to which the duplex receptacle is mounted.

The Examiner will also appreciate that Protzmann is for a completely different application from what is intended with the methodology of the present application. The

present application is concerned with the interconnection of two cables between a wall panel (in one example a floor panel) in a mobile platform, that provides a relative flush mounting on one side of the bracket member, with the interconnection of the two electrical cables being located at a position that is elevationally offset from the interior wall panel, and in one example below the floor panel. This enables the interconnection of the cables to be kept away from areas where individuals might otherwise accidentally kick the interconnecting cables. The Protzmann apparatus would be wholly unsuited for use in a mobile platform as it presents itself as a significant protuberance from the wall surface which it is secured to.

The undersigned also respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in this art, who is attempting to solve the problem of how to construct a method to interconnect and support two cables, in a secure and unobtrusive manner, within a mobile platform, and more particularly adjacent to an interior wall panel of a mobile platform, would not have found the presently claimed methods obvious from simply viewing Protzmann. Again, Protzmann is related to a residential duplex electrical receptacle with a somewhat crude safety cover that is connected by screw (item 28) to the duplex receptacle. This is just fundamentally different from the present problem which the claimed methods of the present application are addressing.

New claim 41 calls out the operation of disposing a gasket between the interior wall panel and the opening, and new claim 42 calls out the limitation of securing the first and second electrical cables to a connector that is secured to the support member. These claims are also believed to be allowable over Protzmann.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Nov. 21, 2007

By: 
Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDE/chs